

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

MADYUN ABDULHASEEB,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	NO. CIV-22-0252-HE
	)	
WILLIAM “CHRIS” RANKINS, Acting	)	
Warden	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**ORDER**

Petitioner Madyun Abdulhaseeb, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed this case asserting a right to habeas relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. He challenges the Oklahoma Pardon and Parole Board’s (the “Board”) decision to deny him parole and asks the Court to order that he be granted an appearance before the Board and declare that the Board’s application of certain statutes when considering his parole request violated the Ex Post Facto Clause and/or was in impermissible bill of attainder. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C), the matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Amanda Green for initial proceedings. Upon initial screening, Judge Green issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the petition be dismissed because the claims asserted in this case are duplicative of the claims asserted in petitioner’s petition in CIV-21-1016. Petitioner has objected to the Report, which triggers *de novo* review of the matters to which objection has been made.

Petitioner’s specific objections in this case restate his objections to the Report and Recommendation in CIV-21-1016. The court agrees with the Report that petitioner’s

grounds for relief in this case are duplicative of the grounds for relief in the earlier case. For the reasons stated in the court's order adopting the Report and Recommendation entered this date in CIV-21-1016, petitioner's claims for relief fail on their merits. This case must be dismissed because the petition fails to state a plausible basis for relief.

Accordingly, the court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation [Doc. #8]. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [Doc. #1] is **DISMISSED** without prejudice but without leave to amend. Further, the court concludes that a certificate of appealability should not issue because petitioner has failed to demonstrate "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." *Id.* § 2253(c)(2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> of August, 2022.



---

JOE HEATON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE